REMARKS

Claims 23-25, 27-35 and 38-53 are pending in the present Application. Claims 41, 45, 48 and 51 have been amended.

No new matter has been introduced by the foregoing amendments. Support for amendments to independent claims 45, 48 and 51 may be found, for example, on page 37 of the specification.

Rejection - 35 U.S.C. § 112

The Examiner has rejected claims 41 and 48-53 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

With respect to claim 41, the Examiner argues that, "it is unclear how information can obtain information." Office Action, page 4. Though Applicant does not necessarily agree with the Examiner, claim 41 has been amended to recite that, "...the display control information is used by the communication means to obtain the display information corresponding to the status update information." Thus, claim 41 recites that the display information is being obtained by the communication means and not by "other information." Accordingly, Applicant submits that the Examiner's rejection of claim 41 has been overcome.

The Examiner has rejected claim 48 as being indefinite, arguing that, "the icons cannot be both 'stored in the client terminal without being displayed,' and displayed by the client terminal." Office Action, pages 4-5. Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's assertion. Claim 48 recites that a plurality of icons are received in response to a second request. This plurality of icons are received, but not displayed to the user. Instead, one icon selected from the plurality of icons is displayed after a third request is transmitted. Claim 48 has been amended to further clarify that the third request occurs after the second request and that one icon from the plurality of icons is selected in response to the third request. Therefore, it is clear that in the system of claim 48, icons are received and stored in response to the second request and an icon is selected and displayed in response to a third request that is subsequent to the second request. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 48 is definite. Claim 51 recites features similar to those of claim 48 and therefore is definite for similar reasons.

The Examiner has not addressed claims 49-50 and 52-52 in the rejection. Accordingly,

Applicant believes these claims to be rejected under § 112 only as being dependent on the independent base claims.

In view of the arguments and amendments discussed above, reconsideration and withdrawal of the Examiner's rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112 are respectfully requested.

Rejection - 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner rejected claims 23-25, 27-35 and 38-53 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0036793 to Roosen ("Roosen") in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,293,067 to Maki ("Maki"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

1. <u>Roosen</u>

Roosen at paragraph [0099] describes a process in which a browser B in a client computer requests web pages from a server 310. A device status frame 45 (Fig. 15) is one of several frames in a web page which is transmitted from the server in response to each request from the browser. The status frame 45 displays icons which represent the status of each printer known to the server. In paragraph [0109], Roosen describes a script included in the web page that causes the browser to request updated web frames at prescribed intervals. Thus, at the prescribed intervals, the browser transmits a status request to the server, requesting at least one new frame, for instance, the device status frame 45.

As described by Roosen at paragraphs [0104] and [0109] the server creates frame 45 which "presents information on the printers of the group including their statuses." <u>Each time a request is made to the server, the server formulates a new frame 45</u>, including the control information for displaying the display information and updated status icons.

The method disclosed by Roosen dynamically prepares a web page containing the requested information and sends the requested web page to the requesting browser. The web server is disclosed as having a set of web pages available for different browser requests (see paragraph [0099]). However, only the one selected web page is sent to the client. The web server is of a kind that that uses Active Server Pages (ASP.NET). Based on the foregoing, one skilled

in the art would understand that each web page is generated using HTML and includes both information to be displayed and the control information for displaying the information in each frame of the web page.

Roosen transmits frame 45 including a plurality of updated status icons from the server to the client each time status is requested by the client. The updated icons transmitted from the server in response to each status request represent the status of each printer known to the server. As shown by Roosen in Fig. 15, the client PC displays frame 45 including all the updated status icons each time it is received.

In contrast to Roosen, in claim 45, a plurality of icons representing a plurality of potential statuses of the data processing apparatus are received by the client from the data processing apparatus. These statuses are not immediately presented to the user on a web page, as in Roosen, but are only stored. When information relating to the current status of the data processing apparatus is received in response to the third request, one of these plurality of icons is selected and presented to the user.

The Examiner argues that in Roosen the icons must be stored in RAM before they can be displayed. Office Action, page 9. However, Applicant respectfully points out that even if, as the Examiner suggests, such icons are stored in RAM prior to displaying, claim 45 recites that an icon is displayed to the user after one of the icons is selected in response to a third request. There is no such disclosure or suggestion in Roosen.

2. Maki

Maki discloses using icon information to notify the client of device status. In Maki, a client request is received and a single icon representing the status of the device is selected by the device. The selected icon is then placed into a response packet and transmitted to the client in response to a device status request. Column 17, lines 10-14. Finally, the icon is received by the client and displayed to the user.

The Examiner argues that Maki discloses, "providing....display information comprising a plurality of icons representative of the status of the data processing apparatus." Office Action, page 9. However, Maki only discloses selecting a single icon ("examine device status, and determine device icon to be notified; generate response packet including device icon to be

11

notified") by the printer and transmitting that icon to the client. Fig. 34, ref. S3103 and S3104.

Maki does not teach or suggest that a plurality of icons are transmitted from the data processing

apparatus and stored without being displayed on the client. Further, Maki also does not disclose

or suggest that one of the plurality of icons is selected to be displayed at the client, as recited in

claim 45.

3. Patentability of independent claim 45 over the combination of Roosen and Maki.

Independent claim 45 reads as follows (underlining added for emphasis):

A method of controlling the display on a client terminal of a status of a data processing apparatus connected to the client terminal via a network comprising:

transmitting a first request for display control information to the data processing apparatus;

providing the display control information to the client terminal in response to the first request and thereafter storing the display control information;

transmitting a second request for display information to the data processing apparatus based on the stored display control information;

providing the display information from the data processing apparatus to the client terminal in response to the second request, said display information comprising a plurality of icons representative of a plurality of possible statuses of the data processing apparatus, the display information being stored in the client terminal without being displayed until at least after a third request is transmitted, wherein the third request is transmitted after the display information is provided; and

transmitting the third request to the data processing apparatus subsequent to storing the display information, wherein in response to the third status request, the data processing apparatus transmits identification data identifying one of the plurality of previously stored icons representative of the status of the data processing apparatus to the client terminal, and the client terminal displays, based on the identification data, only the identified icon, wherein the identified icon is representative of the current status of the data processing apparatus.

None of the above-underlined features are disclosed or suggested in either of the applied

references.

Regarding the step of "providing the display information...," in Roosen, printer status

information is received and displayed to the user in the form of a web site transmitted from a

web browser located on a workstation. Roosen, paragraph [0099]. Even if, as the Examiner

contends, the user in Roosen may select for which printer to view status information, there is no

disclosure or suggestion of storing a plurality of icons without displaying them until after a third

request is transmitted, as in claim 45. That is, in Roosen, whether a single printer or multiple printers are selected, the status information web page is received and displayed as one step. Maki does not cure this deficiency of Roosen because contrary to the Examiner's assertion, Maki does not disclose or suggest transmitting a plurality of icons representative of possible statuses of the data processing apparatus to a client. In Maki, the device selects a single icon representative of the status of the device and transmits a response packet to the client. Thus, in both Roosen and Maki, only icons representative of the current status of the device are transmitted. There is no disclosure or suggestion of transmitting and storing on the client a plurality of icons representative of a plurality of possible statuses, as in claim 45.

In contrast to Roosen, in independent claim 45, a plurality of icons are transmitted to and stored on the client. These icons are not displayed to the user until after the third request is transmitted. In fact, the method of claim 45 displays an icon only after information is received identifying one of the icons from the plurality of icons. This information is received in response to a third request. Neither Roosen or Maki discloses or suggests such a two-step process because in both references the status information is output to the display each and every time updated status information is received by the client.

The combination of Roosen and Maki also does not disclose or suggest, "transmitting the third request...," as recited in independent claim 45. As previously discussed, because in both Roosen and in Maki only icons representing the current state of the device (as opposed to a plurality of icons representing a plurality of possible device statuses) are transmitted, the client does not store a plurality of icons representing possible statuses of the data processing device. Thus, there can be no disclosure or suggestion in Roosen or Maki of the third request which identifies one of the previously transmitted plurality of icons as the current status of the display device. Further, there is no disclosure or suggestion of selecting one of the previously stored plurality of icons in the client for display to the user. That is, though both Roosen and Maki may select an icon to display to the user, the selection and transmission occurs at the web server. Thus, the icon to be displayed must be transmitted each time the device status is updated. In contrast to both Roosen and Maki, since the plurality of icons are stored on the client, the server only identifies the icon, but needs not transmit the icon to the client. The selected icon is then retrieved from the client's storage and displayed to the user. There is no such disclosure or suggestion in the combination of Roosen and Maki.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that independent claim 45 is allowable for at least the reasons recited above. Independent claims 48 and 51 recite features similar to those of claim 45 and are allowable for similar reasons.

In view of the arguments and amendments discussed above, reconsideration and withdrawal of the Examiner's rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 are respectfully requested.

4. Patentability of the dependent claims

The dependent claims 23-25, 27-35 and 38-44, 46-47, 49-50 and 52-53 are believed to be patentable over the applied references for at least the reason that they are dependent upon allowable base claims and because they recite additional patentable elements and steps.

Conclusion

Insofar as the Examiner's rejections were fully addressed, the instant application is in condition for allowance. Issuance of a Notice of Allowability of all pending claims is therefore earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Kengo OCHI

_04/19/2011_
(Date)

By: _J. Franek_ (Reg. No. 59,439) for:
Clark A. Jablon
Attorney/Agent for Applicant
Registration No. 35,039
E-Mail: cjablon@panitchlaw com
Panitch Schwarze Belisario & Nadel LLP
One Commerce Square
2005 Market Street, Suite 2200
Philadelphia, PA 19103
Telephone No.: 215-965-1330
Direct Dial: 215-965-1293
Fax No.: 215-965-1331

CAJ/LK

15